

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the Metropolitan Lutheran Ministry on this, their 25th anniversary and for their valiant efforts in the war on poverty.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MICHAEL P. FORBES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, July 26, 1996*

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I accompanied the President of the United States to Long Island to meet with the families of the victims of the tragic TWA Flight 800. The entire Nation has been paralyzed by this disaster. My prayers and thoughts are with those families and it is my hope that as a nation we can begin to move beyond the hurt and anger.

Therefore, I was unavoidably detained from being here to cast my vote on H.R. 3816, the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act of 1997. Had I been here I would have voted "no" on rollcall No. 357, "yes" on rollcall No. 358, "no" on rollcall No. 359, and "yes" on rollcall No. 360.

Finally, on rollcall No. 361 I would have voted "yes" and on rollcall No. 362 I would have voted "no."

#### FOOD QUALITY PROTECTION ACT OF 1996

SPEECH OF

HON. CHARLES W. STENHOLM

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, July 23, 1996*

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, can we fault the legislative process in any way in bringing forth this bill? I don't think so.

Was a compromise reached? With much give and take, yes.

Is this the very best policy for all parties concerned? I am sure some have reservations about that.

Do I still have reservations? Most definitely. This is not same Food Quality Protection Act that I originally cosponsored.

However, knowing full well that the jury is still out, and will be for some time, on the success of this major piece of legislation, we have to first look at its evolution—years of debate and struggle to reach the middle ground and now, finally, almost overnight, the end is in sight. Perhaps this suddenness after so long of a time where nothing seemed possible has made me a little overcautious. Perhaps in hindsight too much was left on the table. Every concerned party could make these arguments today. You can about most any legislation offered that finally becomes law, but can you argue that the process was circumvented? Not very easily.

There would be few to deny that passing this legislation this year was a top priority. I have always pushed for reform based on sound science and will continue to do so. H.R. 1627 makes a move in that direction. Let us take this opportunity to address these issues in that light. I respect the process and the need to move when the opportunity presents itself, but I remind you that agriculture must be diligent in striving for a good compromise. I

believe the most important thing to remember with this legislation is to hold a belief—or if you don't have the belief, work on developing one—that focuses on the future and instills faith that common sense coupled with scientific reason will always provide a reasonable solution to such complex issues as this.

#### DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997

SPEECH OF

HON. CHARLIE NORWOOD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, July 24, 1996*

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3814) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes:

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Chairman. I rise to express my support for the gentleman from Iowa's amendment. This amendment would prevent the U.S. Patent Office from issuing patents to health care providers for medical procedures they create.

The fact that I must speak on such an issue greatly disturbs me. As a health care provider, I have always understood that my job was to help patients. It is not to make myself rich. It is not to make myself famous. My job is to improve the health and well-being of those people who place their trust in my hands.

When I became a dentist, I vowed to act in my patients' best interest. It is the moral and ethical duty of every health care provider to be a patient advocate. Patenting medical procedures, which essentially forces other health providers to compensate the original provider for their procedure, is a twisted way to practice medicine. Congress has a moral duty to ensure that we do not allow the Federal Government to place its stamp of approval on this essentially selfish act.

In addition to the ethical implications of medical procedure patents, there is also the matter of increased costs. Unlike the Clinton administration, which took its one shot at improving the health care of Americans by nationalizing the health care system, this Congress has made significant and substantive efforts to make health care more accessible and more affordable. Allowing health providers to patent procedures they develop to help their patients will not only create perverse incentives in the health care market, it will also drive up the cost of health care. If we do not pass this amendment, we will be condemning patients and their employers to escalating health care costs. We may also be forcing providers into using less advanced procedures because they want to avoid the additional costs of using the patented procedure.

The health provider community must not allow itself to succumb to those corrupt forces that have overtaken the health payer industry. Once the provider turns his back on the patient, there will be no one to ensure that the patients interests are protected. The health provider community must never forget the great privilege it has to improve their patient's physical condition.

The United States cannot afford to be on the trailing edge of this issue. already, over 80 countries ban medical procedure patents. These countries include Britain, France, and Israel, as well as countries like South Africa, Colombia, and Saudi Arabia. For the sake of patients in this country, this Congress must take a stand and protect patients from opportunistic health providers and rising health care costs.

I urge my colleagues to support the Ganske amendment.

#### NATIONAL KOREAN WAR VETERANS ARMISTICE DAY

HON. WILLIAM J. COYNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, July 26, 1996*

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the 43d anniversary of the end of the Korean war.

This war, often referred to as the forgotten war, played an important role in modern world history. Its impact on the course of the cold war cannot be understated. The United States response to the North Korean invasion of South Korea demonstrated that the United States would not idly stand by and allow Communist countries to invade their neighbors. Our response indicated that even after the carnage of World War II, Americans were still willing to make heavy sacrifices to defend freedom and fight Communist dictatorships around the globe.

Following its liberation from the Japanese in 1945 at the end of World War II, Korea was divided into two temporary zones of occupation, controlled by the United States and the Soviet Union, pending the establishment of a legitimate Korean national government. Subsequently, the Soviets refused to relinquish political control over North Korea. U.N.-sanctioned elections were held in the south on May 10, 1948, but the Soviet Union established a puppet regime in the north which boycotted the elections. The following year, the United States forces completed their withdrawal from South Korea. The United Nations attempted to mediate the disagreement between the North Korean regime—the People's Democratic Republic of Korea—and the Republic of Korea [ROK] in the south, but tensions remained high as both governments insisted on reunification under their exclusive control.

On June 25, 1950, North Korean forces equipped with Soviet-made weapons invaded South Korea with the intent of reunifying the country by force. The United States and the free world responded to this aggression rapidly. On June 27, the U.N. Security Council passed a resolution calling upon its member states to help the Republic of Korea repel the North Korean invasion. The same day, President Truman ordered U.S. forces into action on the side of the South Koreans.

The North Korean Army met with initial success. They shattered the South Korean Army, captured the South Korean capital, Seoul, and swept south to occupy almost the entire Korean peninsula. The first United States ground troops to go into combat were badly outnumbered and inadequately supported—and they suffered heavy losses—but the United States and ROK forces eventually established